arXiv:1702.08113v1 [math.OC] 26 Feb 2017

Extended trust region problems over one or two balls: exact (semi-)Lagrangian relaxations

Immanuel M. Bomze

ISOR, University of Vienna, Austria

Vaithilingam Jeyakumar

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

Guoyin Li

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

---

Abstract

We present exact copositive relaxation and global optimality conditions for an extended trust-region problem under suitable conditions by way of studying its semi-Lagrangian duality. We then establish conditions under which exactness of semi-Lagrangian relaxations, or of the usual Lagrangian relaxation, holds for an extended CDT (two-ball trust-region) problem.

Key words: Copositive matrices, non-convex optimization, quadratic optimization, quadratically constrained problem, global optimality condition, relaxation.

January 18, 2017

1 Introduction

Consider the following nonconvex quadratic optimization problem, which is referred to as the extended trust region problem:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\mathrm{P}) & \min\limits_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} & \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} & \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_1 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_1^\top \mathsf{x} \leq 1 \\ & & \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{a}\|^2 \leq 1 \\ & & \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \leq \mathsf{b}, \end{array}$$

where $\mathsf{Q}_0, \mathsf{Q}_1$ are $(n \times n)$ symmetric matrices, A is an $(\ell \times n)$ matrix, B is an $(m \times n)$ matrix, $\mathsf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, $\mathsf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathsf{q}_0, \mathsf{q}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Model problems of this form arise from the application of the trust region method for solving constrained optimization problems, such as nonlinear optimization problems with linear inequality constraints [14] and robust optimization problems under matrix norm or polyhedral data uncertainty [5, 19]. It covers many important and challenging quadratic optimization (QP) problems such as (QP) with box constraints, trust region problems with additional linear constraints and the CDT (two-ball trust-region) problem [1, 8, 13, 30]. In general, with no further structure on the additional linear constraints $\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \leq \mathsf{b}$, the model problem (P) is NP-hard as it encompasses the quadratic program with box constraints.

In the special case where Q_1 is the identity matrix, A, B are zero matrices and $\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}, \mathsf{q}_1$ are zero vectors, the model problem (P) reduces to the well-known trust-region model. It has been extensively studied from both theoretical and algorithmic points of view [18, 31]. The trust-region problem enjoys exact Lagrangian and semi-definite programming (SDP) relaxations. Moreover, its solution can be found by solving a dual Lagrangian system or an SDP. Unfortunately, these nice features do not continue to hold for the more general extended trust-region problem (P) [19]. In fact, it has been shown that, the exact Lagrangian (or SDP) relaxation can fail for the CDT problem or the trust region problem with one additional linear inequality constraint.

Recently, copositive optimization has emerged as one of the important tools for studying nonconvex quadratic optimization problems. Copositive optimization is a special case of convex conic optimization (namely, to minimize a linear function over a cone subject to linear constraints). By now, equivalent copositive reformulations for many important problems are known, among them (non-convex, mixed-binary, fractional) quadratic optimization

problems under a mild assumption [2, 3, 12], and some special optimization problems under uncertainty [4, 17, 25, 29].

In light of rapid evolution of this field, the purpose of this paper is two-fold: first, we introduce a semi-Lagrangian dual problem for (P) and show that the semi-Lagrangian dual problem can be equivalently reformulated as a copositive program. We show, via a simple example, that a semi-Lagrangian dual or its tractable approximation can enjoy exact relaxation result while the usual Lagrangian dual problem yields trivial lower bound with infinite duality gap. We also provide a global optimality condition and establish conditions for an exact copositive relaxation of the nonconvex quadratic optimization problem (P). Second, we provide sufficient conditions ensuring exact usual Lagrangian relaxation for an important subclass referred to as the extended CDT (or two-ball trust region, TTR) problem.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we first recall notation and terminology, and present some basic facts on copositivity. In Section 3, we introduce the semi-Lagrangian relaxation for (P) and its copositive reformulation. We also provide a global optimality condition and prove an exactness result for the copositive relaxation of (P). In Section 4, we examine the extended CDT problem and provide simple conditions ensuring the tightness of both the semi-Lagrangian relaxation and the usual Lagrangian relaxation.

2 Preliminaries

We abbreviate by $[m:n] := \{m, m+1, \ldots, n\}$ the integer range between two integers m, n with $m \leq n$. By bold-faced lower-case letters we denote vectors in n-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, by bold-faced upper case letters matrices, and by $^\top$ transposition. The positive orthant is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^n_+ := \{\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in [1:n]\}$. I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix with columns e_i, $i \in [1:n]$, while $\mathsf{e} := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{e}_i = [1, \ldots, 1]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the compact *standard simplex* is

$$\Delta := \left\{\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ : \mathsf{e}^\top \mathsf{x} = 1\right\},$$

which of course satisfies $\mathbb{R}_+\Delta = \mathbb{R}^n_+$. The letters o and O stand for zero vectors, and zero matrices, respectively, of appropriate orders. The set of all $n \times n$ matrices is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, and the closure (resp. interior) of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\mathrm{cl}(S)$ (resp. $\mathrm{int}\, S$).

For a given symmetric matrix $\mathsf{H} = \mathsf{H}^\top$, we denote the fact that H is positive-semidefinite by $\mathsf{H} \succeq \mathsf{O}$. Sometimes we write instead "H is psd." Denoting the smallest eigenvalue of any symmetric matrix $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}^\top$ by $\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{M})$, we thus have $\mathsf{H} \succeq \mathsf{O}$ if and only if $\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{H}) \geq 0$. Linear forms in symmetric matrices X will play an important role in this paper; they are expressed by Frobenius duality $\langle \mathsf{S}, \mathsf{X} \rangle = \mathrm{trace}(\mathsf{SX})$, where $\mathsf{S} = \mathsf{S}^\top$ is another symmetric matrix of the same order as X. By $\mathsf{A} \oplus \mathsf{B}$ we denote the direct sum of two square matrices:

$$\mathsf{A} \oplus \mathsf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{A} & \mathsf{O} \\ \mathsf{O}^\top & \mathsf{B} \end{bmatrix} .$$

For any optimization problem, say (Q), we denote by val(Q) its optimal objective value (attained or not).

Given any cone $\mathcal{C}$ of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices,

$$\mathcal{C}^\star := \left\{ \mathsf{S} = \mathsf{S}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : \langle \mathsf{S}, \mathsf{X} \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \mathsf{X} \in \mathcal{C} \right\}$$

denotes the dual cone of $\mathcal{C}$. For instance, if $\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \mathsf{X} = \mathsf{X}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : \mathsf{X} \succeq \mathsf{O} \right\}$, then $\mathcal{C}^\star = \mathcal{C}$ itself, an example of a *self-dual cone*. Trusting the sharp eyes of our readers, we chose a notation with subtle differences between the five-star denoting a dual cone, e.g., $\mathcal{C}^\star$, and the six-star, e.g. z^*, denoting optimality.

The key notion used below is that of *copositivity*. Given a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix Q, and a closed, convex cone $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we say that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Q} \text{ is } \Gamma\text{-copositive if} \quad & \mathsf{v}^\top \mathsf{Q} \mathsf{v} \geq 0 \text{ for all } \mathsf{v} \in \Gamma , \quad \text{and that} \\ \mathsf{Q} \text{ is strictly } \Gamma\text{-copositive if} \quad & \mathsf{v}^\top \mathsf{Q} \mathsf{v} > 0 \text{ for all } \mathsf{v} \in \Gamma \setminus \{\mathsf{o}\} . \end{aligned}$$

Strict copositivity generalizes positive-definiteness (all eigenvalues strictly positive) and copositivity generalizes positive-semidefiniteness (no eigenvalue strictly negative) of a symmetric matrix. Checking copositivity is NP-hard for most cones Γ of interest, see [15, 24] for the classical case $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^n_+$ studied already by Motzkin [23] who coined the notion back in 1952. In the sequel, we will use "copositive" synonymous for "$\mathbb{R}^n_+$-copositive" in Motzkin's sense.

The set of all Γ-copositive matrices forms a closed, convex matrix cone, the *copositive cone*

$$\mathcal{C}^\star_\Gamma := \left\{ \mathsf{Q} = \mathsf{Q}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : \mathsf{Q} \text{ is } \Gamma\text{-copositive} \right\}$$

with non-empty interior $\mathrm{int}\, \mathcal{C}^\star_\Gamma$, which exactly consists of all strictly Γ-copositive matrices. However, the cone $\mathcal{C}^\star_\Gamma$ is not self-dual. Rather one can

show that $\mathcal{C}_\Gamma^\star$ is the dual cone of

$$\mathcal{C}_\Gamma := \left\{ \mathsf{X} = \mathsf{F}\mathsf{F}^\top : \mathsf{F} \text{ has } \binom{n+1}{2} \text{ columns in } \Gamma \right\},$$

the cone of Γ-*completely positive (cp)* matrices. Note that the factor matrix F has many more columns than rows. A perhaps more amenable representation is

$$\mathcal{C}_\Gamma = \text{conv } \left\{ \mathsf{x}\mathsf{x}^\top : \mathsf{x} \in \Gamma \right\},$$

where conv S stands for the convex hull of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Caratheodory's theorem then elucidates the bound $\binom{n+1}{2}$ on the number of columns in F above, which is not sharp in the classical case $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^n_+$ but asymptotically tight [9, 27].

Next, we specify a result on reducing Υ-copositivity with $\Upsilon = \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ to a combination of psd and classical copositivity conditions. This result will be used later on.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\Upsilon = \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and partition a $(p+n) \times (p+n)$ matrix M as follows:*

$$\mathsf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{R} & \mathsf{S}^\top \\ \mathsf{S} & \mathsf{H} \end{bmatrix} \quad \textit{where} \quad \mathsf{R} \textit{ is a } p \times p\textit{-matrix.}$$

Then M is Υ-copositive if and only if the following two conditions hold:

(a) H *is positive semidefinite and* $\mathsf{H}\mathsf{H}^\dagger\mathsf{S} = \mathsf{S}$*, i.e., ker* $\mathsf{H} \subseteq$ *ker* $\mathsf{S}^\top$*;*

(b) $\mathsf{R} - \mathsf{S}^\top\mathsf{H}^\dagger\mathsf{S}$ *is* $(\mathbb{R}^p_+-)$*copositive.*

Here $\mathsf{H}^\dagger$ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of H.

Proof. The argument is an easy extension of the arguments that led to [8, Thm.3.1]. □

3 Copositive and semi-Lagrangian relaxation

The problem we study here is given by

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{(P)} & \min\limits_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} & f_0(\mathsf{x}) := \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} & f_1(\mathsf{x}) := \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_1 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_1^\top \mathsf{x} - 1 \leq 0 \\ & & f_2(\mathsf{x}) := \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{a}\|^2 - 1 \leq 0 \\ & & \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \leq \mathsf{b}. \end{array}$$

Following [6], we introduce the semi-Lagrangian for the model problem (P) which can be rewritten as

$$z^* := \inf\{f_0(\mathsf{x}) : \mathsf{x} \in F \cap P\} \quad \text{with } P := \{\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \leq \mathsf{b}\}\ , \tag{1}$$

where $F := \{\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(\mathsf{x}) \leq 0\,,\ i = 1, 2\}$, $\mathsf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and B is a $p \times n$ matrix.

For our approach, it will be convenient to introduce slack variables $s_j := b_j - (\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x})_j$ for all $j \in [1\!:\!p]$, arriving at new primal-feasible points $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$, in other words, to replace P with

$$\bar{P} := \left\{\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n : \bar{\mathsf{B}}\mathsf{y} = \mathsf{b}\right\}$$

with the $p \times (p+n)$-matrix $\bar{\mathsf{B}} := [\mathsf{I}_p \,|\, \mathsf{B}]$.

We now need to extend all original functions in the obvious way, namely $\bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) = \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) = f_i(\mathsf{x})$ by writing $\bar{\mathsf{Q}}_i = \mathsf{O} \oplus \mathsf{Q}_i$, i.e., adding p zero rows and p zero columns to Q_i, arriving at symmetric matrices of order $p + n$; likewise we define $\bar{\mathsf{q}}_i^\top = [\mathsf{o}^\top, \mathsf{q}_i^\top]$. Finally, by introducing another quadratic constraint, defining $\bar{\mathsf{Q}}_3 = \bar{\mathsf{B}}^\top \bar{\mathsf{B}}$, $\bar{\mathsf{q}}_3 = \bar{\mathsf{B}}^\top \mathsf{b}$ and $c_3 = \mathsf{b}^\top \mathsf{b}$, we rephrase the p linear constraints $\bar{\mathsf{B}}\mathsf{y} = \mathsf{b}$ into one quadratic constraint $\bar{f}_3(\mathsf{y}) = \|\bar{\mathsf{B}}\mathsf{y} - \mathsf{b}\|^2 \leq 0$.

In this way, the original problem (1) is rephrased in a somehow standardized form, namely

$$z^* = \inf\left\{\bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) : \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) \leq 0\,,\ i \in [1\!:\!3]\,,\ \mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\right\}\ . \tag{2}$$

The optimal value z^* of (1) need not be attained, and it could also be equal to $-\infty$ (in the unbounded case) or to $+\infty$ (in the infeasible case). Considering $\mathsf{Q}_i = \mathsf{O}$ would also allow for linear inequality constraints. But it is often advisable to discriminate the functional form of constraints, and we will adhere to this principle in what follows.

Throughout this paper, we assume that the feasible set of problem (P) is non-empty.

3.1 Semi-Lagrangian duality

Let $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Now consider multipliers $\mathsf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ of the inequality constraints $\bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) = f_i(\mathsf{x}) \leq 0$, $i \in [1\!:\!3]$, and $\mathsf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+$ for the sign constraints $\mathsf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+$. Then we define the full Lagrangian function for problem (2) as

$$L(\mathsf{y}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) := \bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) + u_1 \bar{f}_1(\mathsf{y}) + u_2 \bar{f}_2(\mathsf{y}) + u_3 \bar{f}_3(\mathsf{y}) - \mathsf{v}^\top \mathsf{s}\,.$$

Define

$$\Theta(\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) := \inf \left\{ L(\mathsf{y}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n} \right\}\,. \tag{3}$$

The usual Lagrangian dual optimal value is

$$z^*_{LD} := \sup \left\{ \Theta(\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) : (\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^p_+ \right\}\,. \tag{4}$$

The idea to incorporate some of the constraints defining $F \cap P$ into the ground set, or equivalently, to relax only some of the constraints, leads to the corresponding semi-Lagrangian (sometimes also called *partial Lagrangian*) dual and is not new, see, e.g. [16] and references therein. However, previous work has concentrated to do this with linear equality constraints, which then leads to an SDP formulation. Here, we take an alternative path, incorporating the sign constraints for the slack variables into the ground set, and relax all quadratic constraints including $\bar{f}_3(\mathsf{y}) = \|\bar{\mathsf{B}}\mathsf{y} - \mathsf{b}\|^2 \leq 0$ expressing $\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \leq \mathsf{b}$.

So we arrive at the semi-Lagrangian variant

$$\Theta_{\text{semi}}(\mathsf{u}) := \inf \left\{ L(\mathsf{y}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{o}) : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \right\}\,, \tag{5}$$

with dual optimal value

$$z^*_{\text{semi}} := \sup \left\{ \Theta_{\text{semi}}(\mathsf{u}) : \mathsf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \right\}\,. \tag{6}$$

The relation between full and semi-Lagrangian bounds is a general principle, yielding the following chain of inequalities

$$z^*_{LD} \leq z^*_{\text{semi}} \leq z^*\,,$$

where the last inequality above follows, again, from standard weak duality.

Next, we establish the copositivity characterization of semi-Lagrangian relaxation problem. To this end, we denote by $\mathsf{e}_0 = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{1+p+n}$, and by

$$\mathsf{J}_0 := \mathsf{e}_0 \mathsf{e}_0^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathsf{o}^\top \\ \mathsf{o} & \mathsf{O} \end{bmatrix}\,.$$

Consider a quadratic function $q(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{y}^\top \mathsf{H}\mathsf{y} - 2\mathsf{d}^\top \mathsf{y} + \gamma$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{p+n}$, with $q(\mathsf{o}) = \gamma$, $\nabla q(\mathsf{o}) = -2\mathsf{d}$ and $D^2 q(\mathsf{o}) = 2\mathsf{H}$ (the factors 2 being here just for ease of later notation). For this q we define the *Shor relaxation matrix [28]* as

$$\mathsf{M}(q) := \begin{bmatrix} \gamma & -\mathsf{d}^\top \\ -\mathsf{d} & \mathsf{H} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

Lemma 3.1 (Copositivity characterization of semi-Lagrangian dual) *Consider problem (1) and its semi-Lagrangian dual function as defined in (5), the dual z^*_{semi} as defined in (6), as well as the polyhedral cone $\Upsilon = \mathbb{R}^{p+1}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for the quadratic $q = L(\cdot; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{o})$ and with the notation from (7), we have*

$$\Theta_{\text{semi}}(\mathsf{u}) = \sup\{\mu : \mu \in \mathbb{R}\,,\ \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot;\mathsf{u},\mathsf{o})) - \mu \mathsf{J}_0 \text{ is } \Upsilon\text{-copositive}\}$$

and the semi-Lagrangian dual problem of (1) can be written as

$$z^*_{\text{semi}} = \sup\left\{\mu : (\mu, \mathsf{u}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3_+,\ \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot;\mathsf{u},\mathsf{o})) - \mu \mathsf{J}_0 \text{ is } \Upsilon\text{-copositive}\right\}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. For any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and any quadratic q, it can be verified by a straightforward extension of [16, Lemma 1] (for the psd.case $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{p+n}$), and of [6, Lemma 2.1] (for the classical copositive case $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{p+n}_+$), that the following two conditions are equivalent:

(a) $q(\mathsf{y}) \geq \mu$ for all $\mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$;

(b) the $(n+p+1)\times(n+p+1)$-matrix $\mathsf{M}(q-\mu) = \mathsf{M}(q) - \mu \mathsf{J}_0$ is Υ-copositive.

This equivalence implies the identity

$$\inf\{q(\mathsf{y}) : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\} = \sup\{\mu \in \mathbb{R} : \mathsf{M}(q) - \mu \mathsf{J}_0 \text{ is } \Upsilon\text{-copositive}\}. \tag{9}$$

Note that above equality holds, by the usual convention that $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$, also if q is unbounded from below on $\mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$. The conclusion follows. □

For easy reference, we detail the matrix $\mathsf{M}(L(\cdot;\mathsf{u},\mathsf{o})) - \mu \mathsf{J}_0$ below:

$$\begin{bmatrix} -u_1 - u_2 + u_3\|\mathsf{b}\|^2 - \mu & -u_3\mathsf{b}^\top & \mathsf{q}_0^\top + u_1\mathsf{q}_1^\top - u_2\mathsf{a}^\top\mathsf{A} - u_3\mathsf{b}^\top\mathsf{B} \\ -u_3\mathsf{b} & u_3\mathsf{I}_p & u_3\mathsf{B} \\ \mathsf{q}_0 + u_1\mathsf{q}_1 - u_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{a} - u_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{b} & u_3\mathsf{B}^\top & \mathsf{H}_u + u_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{B} \end{bmatrix} \tag{10}$$

where $\mathsf{H}_u = \mathsf{Q}_0 + u_1\mathsf{Q}_1 + u_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A}$ is the Hessian of the Lagrangian function.

The conic dual of problem (8) is

$$z^*_{\rm cp} = \inf\{\langle \mathsf{M}_0, \mathsf{X}\rangle : \langle \mathsf{M}_i, \mathsf{X}\rangle \le 0,\ i\in[1\!:\!3]\,,\ \langle \mathsf{J}_0, \mathsf{X}\rangle = 1\,,\ \mathsf{X}\in\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon\}\ , \qquad (11)$$

with $\mathsf{M}_i = \mathsf{M}(\bar{f}_i)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\Upsilon = \text{conv}\ \{\mathsf{x}\mathsf{x}^\top : \mathsf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{p+1}_+\times\mathbb{R}^n\}$.

From standard conical lifting and weak duality arguments it follows

$$z^*_{LD} \le z^*_{\rm semi} \le z^*_{\rm cp} \le z^*\ .$$

We now illustrate that, in general, a semi-Lagrangian relaxation can provide a much tighter bound for the model problem (P) than the usual Lagrangian dual. Indeed, in the following example, we see that the semi-Lagrangian relaxation produces an exact relaxation while the usual Lagrangian dual yields a trivial lower bound which has infinite gap. As we will see later (Remark 3.1), one can indeed construct a class of quadratic optimization problem with exact semi-Lagrangian relaxation but infinite Lagrangian duality gap.

Example 3.1 (Semi-Lagrangian vs Lagrangian) *Consider the following nonconvex quadratic optimization problem with simple linear inequality constraints*

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min & q(\mathsf{x}) := \dfrac{1}{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2\\ s.t. & x_1\ge 0,\ x_2\ge 0.\end{array}$$

Clearly, the objective function is not convex and the optimal value of this problem is $z^* = 0$. We next observe that this problem can be converted to our standard form as

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{s})\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2} & \dfrac{1}{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2\\ s.t. & (x_1-s_1)^2 + (x_2-s_2)^2 \le 0\\ & s_1\ge 0, s_2\ge 0.\end{array}$$

Then the copositive characterization of the semi-Lagrangian reads

$$z^*_{\rm semi} = \sup_{\mu\in\mathbb{R},u\ge 0}\left\{\mu : \begin{bmatrix} -\mu & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & u & 0 & -u & 0\\ 0 & 0 & u & 0 & -u\\ 0 & -u & 0 & \frac{1}{2}+u & 1\\ 0 & 0 & -u & 1 & 1+u\end{bmatrix} \ \textit{is } (\mathbb{R}^3_+\times\mathbb{R}^2)\textit{-copositive}\right\}$$

Clearly, from the copositivity requirement, $z^*_{\rm semi} \leq 0$. *Moreover, it can be verified from Lemma 2.1 that, for* $\mu = 0$ *and* $u = 1$, *the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & \frac{3}{2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \textit{is } (\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)\textit{-copositive.}$$

Thus, $z^*_{\rm semi} = z^* = 0$.

Next, we show that $z^*_{\rm LD} = -\infty$. *To see this, we only need to show that for each fixed* $u \geq 0$ *and* $\mathsf{v} = (v_1, v_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$, *we have*

$$\inf_{(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{s})\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2} \{[\frac{1}{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2] + u[(-x_1+s_1)^2 + (-x_2+s_1)^2] + v_1s_1 + v_2s_2\} = -\infty.$$

Indeed, taking $\mathsf{x} = (-t, t)$ *and* $\mathsf{s} = (t, -t)$ *we see that, as* $t \to +\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & [\frac{1}{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2] + u[(-x_1+s_1)^2 + (-x_2+s_1)^2] + v_1s_1 + v_2s_2 \\ = \; & -\frac{1}{2}t^2 + t(v_1 - v_2) \to -\infty\,. \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Tightness of semi-Lagrangian (cp) relaxation

We consider, for $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$, the full Lagrangian function

$$L(\mathsf{y}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) = \bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} u_i \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) - \mathsf{v}^\top \mathsf{s}, \quad (\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^p\,.$$

As in [6], let us say that the pair $(\mathsf{x}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) \in (F \cap P) \times \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^p$ is a *generalized KKT pair* for (1) if and only if, for $\mathsf{s} = \mathsf{b} - \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}$ and $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x})$, it satisfies both the first-order conditions $\nabla_{\mathsf{y}} L(\mathsf{y}; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{v}) = \mathsf{o}$ and as well the complementarity conditions $v_k s_k = 0$ for all $k \in [1\!:\!p]$ and $u_i \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) = 0$ for all $i \in [1\!:\!3]$, but without requiring $v_k \geq 0$.

Then we obtain the following sufficient second-order global optimality condition, which also implies that the semi-Lagrangian relaxation is tight, generalizing a recent result [8, Section 6.3]:

Theorem 3.1 *If at a generalized KKT pair* $(\bar{\mathsf{x}};\bar{\mathsf{u}},\bar{\mathsf{v}}) \in (F \cap P) \times \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^p$ *of problem (1), we have*

$$\bar{\mathsf{S}} := \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot;\bar{\mathsf{u}},\mathsf{o})) - f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})\mathsf{J}_0 \in \mathcal{C}^\star_\Upsilon\,, \tag{12}$$

then $\bar{\mathsf{x}}$ *is a globally optimal solution to (1) and* $z^* = z^*_{\rm semi}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathsf{s}} = \mathsf{b} - \mathsf{B}\bar{\mathsf{x}}$ and $\bar{\mathsf{y}} = (\bar{\mathsf{s}},\bar{\mathsf{x}})$. The complementarity conditions imply $\bar{\mathsf{v}}^\top\bar{\mathsf{s}} = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3} u_i\bar{f}_i(\bar{\mathsf{y}}) = 0$, so that both the standard $L(\bar{\mathsf{y}};\bar{\mathsf{u}},\bar{\mathsf{v}}) = f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})$ and as well $L(\bar{\mathsf{y}};\bar{\mathsf{u}},\mathsf{o}) = f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})$, which will be used now. Indeed, put $\bar{\mathsf{z}}^\top = [1,\bar{\mathsf{y}}^\top]$ and $\bar{\mathsf{X}} = \bar{\mathsf{z}}\bar{\mathsf{z}}^\top \in \mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$. Then from the definition of $\bar{\mathsf{S}}$ we get

$$\langle\bar{\mathsf{X}},\bar{\mathsf{S}}\rangle = \bar{\mathsf{z}}^\top\bar{\mathsf{S}}\bar{\mathsf{z}} = L(\bar{\mathsf{y}};\bar{\mathsf{u}},\mathsf{o}) - f_0(\mathsf{x}) = 0\,,$$

so that $(\bar{\mathsf{X}},\bar{\mathsf{S}})$ form an optimal primal-dual pair for the copositive problem (11) and (8) with zero duality gap. We conclude, by feasibility of $\bar{\mathsf{x}}$ and definition of z^*, and because of (8) with $\mu = f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})$, cf. (12),

$$z^* \le f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}}) \le z^*_{\rm semi} \le z^*_{\rm cp} \le z^*$$

yielding tightness of the semi-Lagrangian relaxation, zero duality gap for the copositive-cp conic optimization problems, and optimality of $\bar{\mathsf{x}}$. □

While checking copositivity is NP-hard, the slack matrix $\bar{\mathsf{S}}$ may lie in a slightly smaller but tractable approximation cone, and then global optimality is guaranteed even in cases where $\bar{\mathsf{S}}$ is indefinite. The difference can also be expressed in properties of the Hessian $\mathsf{H}_{\bar{\mathsf{u}}}$ of the Lagrangian (recall that this is the same irrespective of our decision whether to relax also the linear constraints or not): indeed, a similar condition on the slack matrix yielding tightness of the classical Lagrangian bound (i.e. $z^*_{LD} = z^*$) or the equivalent SDP relaxation [6, Section 5.1] implies that its lower right principal submatrix $\mathsf{H}_{\bar{\mathsf{u}}}$ has to be psd, and we know this is too strong in some cases [31].

By contrast, the condition $\bar{\mathsf{S}} \in \mathcal{C}^\star_\Upsilon$ (giving tightness $z^*_{\rm semi} = z^*$), by the same argument using Lemma 2.1 and (10), only yields positive semidefiniteness of $\mathsf{H}_{\bar{\mathsf{u}}} + \bar{\mathsf{u}}_3\mathsf{B}\mathsf{B}^\top$. Of course, this happens with higher frequency than positive-definiteness of the Hessian, and the discrepancy is not negligible, see [6, Section 5] for an example.

We note that Theorem 3.1 can be used to construct a class of problems where semi-Lagrangian relaxation is always tight while the usual Lagrangian

dual produces trivial bound with infinite duality gaps. To see this, we shall need the following auxiliary result.

Lemma 3.2 *Let* M *be strictly* $\mathbb{R}^n_+$*-copositive; then there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} + \sigma\|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{s}\|^2 > 0 \text{ for all } (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \left(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\right) \setminus \{\mathsf{o}\} \ .$$

Proof. We first note that the conclusion trivially holds if M is further assumed to be positive semidefinite. So we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{M}) < 0$. For any $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote by

$$\mathsf{x}^+ := [\max\{0, x_1\}, \ldots, \max\{0, x_n\}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$$

and by $\mathsf{x}^- := \mathsf{x}^+ - \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ so that $\mathsf{x} = \mathsf{x}^+ - \mathsf{x}^-$. Furthermore, we have $\|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{s}\| \geq \|\mathsf{x}^-\|$ for all $\mathsf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$, as can be seen easily. Therefore we are done if we establish the (non-quadratic) inequality $\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} + \sigma\|\mathsf{x}^-\|^2 > 0$ whenever $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathsf{o}\}$. Now, given M is strictly copositive, we choose $\rho := \min\left\{\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} : \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, \|\mathsf{x}\| = 1\right\} > 0$. Note that $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ if and only if $\|\mathsf{x}^-\| = 0$. By continuity and compactness, we infer existence of an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} \geq \frac{\rho}{2}$ whenever $\|\mathsf{x}^-\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\mathsf{x}\| = 1$. Now we distinguish two cases:
Case 1: $\|\mathsf{x}^-\| \geq \varepsilon\|\mathsf{x}\| > 0$. In this case, we have

$$\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{M})\|\mathsf{x}\|^2 > -\sigma\|\mathsf{x}^-\|^2 ,$$

where we set $\sigma := -2\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{M})/\varepsilon^2 > 0$;

Case 2: $\|\mathsf{x}^-\| \leq \varepsilon\|\mathsf{x}\|$. In this case, one has $\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} \geq \frac{\rho}{2}\|\mathsf{x}\|^2 > -\sigma\|\mathsf{x}^-\|^2$ (for any $\sigma > 0$).

So in both cases, we obtain $\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}\mathsf{x} + \sigma\|\mathsf{x}^-\|^2 > 0$ for all $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathsf{o}\}$, and the lemma is shown. □

Remark 3.1 (A class of problems with tight semi-Lagrangian relaxation and infinite Lagrangian duality gap) *Consider the non-convex quadratic optimization problem*

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{(EP)} & \min & \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} \\ & \textit{subject to} & \|\mathsf{x}\|^2 \leq 1 \, , \\ & & \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \, , \end{array}$$

where Q_0 *is a strictly* $\mathbb{R}^n_+$*-copositive and indefinite matrix. This problem can be regarded as a special case of the model problem* (P) *with* $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \mathsf{I}_n$, $\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{O}$ *and* $\mathsf{a} = 0$. *Direct verification shows that* $\mathsf{o} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *is a global solution with the optimal value* $z^* = 0$. *We first observe that, as* Q_0 *is indefinite, the optimal value of the Lagrangian dual is* $z^*_{\rm LD} = -\infty$.

As Q_0 *is strictly* $\mathbb{R}^n_+$*-copositive, the preceding lemma implies that there exists* $\sigma > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + \sigma \|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{s}\|^2 > 0 \text{ for all } (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \left(\mathbb{R}^n_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\right) \setminus \{\mathsf{o}\} \ .$$

Let $\bar{\mathsf{y}} = (\bar{\mathsf{x}}, \bar{\mathsf{s}})$ *with* $\bar{\mathsf{x}} = \bar{\mathsf{s}} = \mathsf{o} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{\mathsf{u}} = (0, 0, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ *and* $\bar{\mathsf{v}} = \mathsf{o} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. *Then we see that* $(\bar{\mathsf{y}}, \bar{\mathsf{u}}, \bar{\mathsf{v}})$ *is a generalized KKT pair for (EP). Moreover, we have*

$$\mathsf{M}(L(\cdot; \bar{\mathsf{u}}, \mathsf{o})) - f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})\mathsf{J}_0 = \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{o})) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathsf{o}^\top & \mathsf{o}^\top \\ \mathsf{o} & u_3 \mathsf{I}_n & -u_3 \mathsf{I}_n \\ \mathsf{o} & -u_3 \mathsf{I}_n & \mathsf{Q}_0 + u_3 \mathsf{I}_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where $f_0(\mathsf{x}) = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x}$ *for all* $\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\mathsf{J}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathsf{o}^\top \\ \mathsf{o} & \mathsf{O} \end{bmatrix}$. *Note that, for all* $\mathsf{d} := (r, \mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathsf{d}^\top \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot; \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{o}))\mathsf{d} = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + \sigma \|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{s}\|^2 \geq 0,$$

and hence $\mathsf{M}(L(\cdot; \bar{\mathsf{u}}, \mathsf{o})) - f_0(\bar{\mathsf{x}})\mathsf{J}_0 = \mathsf{M}(L(\cdot; \bar{\mathsf{u}}, \mathsf{o}))$ *is copositive.*

Next, we provide a geometric condition ensuring the exactness of the semi-Lagrangian relaxation which does not rely on the information of KKT pairs. To do this, denote $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x})$ and let $\bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}$, $\bar{f}_1(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_1 x + 2\mathsf{q}_1^\top \mathsf{x} - 1$, $\bar{f}_2(\mathsf{y}) = \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{a}\|^2 - 1$ and $\bar{f}_3(\mathsf{y}) = \|\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} + \mathsf{s} - \mathsf{b}\|^2$.

Theorem 3.2 *For the extended trust region problem (P), let*

$$\Omega := \{[\bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}), \bar{f}_1(\mathsf{y}), \bar{f}_2(\mathsf{y}), \bar{f}_3(\mathsf{y})]^\top : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\} + \mathbb{R}^4_+.$$

Suppose that Ω *is closed and convex. Then we have* $z^*_{\rm semi} = z^*$.

Proof. As $z^* \geq z^*_{\rm semi}$ always holds, we can assume without loss of generality that $z^* > -\infty$. As the feasible set of (P) is nonempty, we have $z^* < +\infty$, and hence $z^* \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Thus $[z^* - \epsilon, 0, 0, 0]^\top \notin \Omega$. By the strict separation theorem, there exists $(\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{3} \mu_i a_i > \mu_0(z^* - \epsilon) \quad \text{for all } \mathsf{a} \in \Omega \, .$$

As $\Omega + \mathbb{R}^4_+ \subseteq \Omega$, we get $\mu_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in [0\!:\!3]$. Moreover, by the feasibility, we see that $\mu_0 > 0$. Thus, by dividing μ_0 on both sides, we see that for all $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \mu_i \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) > z^* - \epsilon,$$

where $\lambda_i = \mu_i/\mu_0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. This implies that

$$z^* - \epsilon \leq \inf_{\mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n} \{\bar{f}_0(\mathsf{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \mu_i \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y})\} \leq z^*_{\text{semi}}.$$

By letting $\epsilon \searrow 0$, we have $z^* \leq z^*_{\text{semi}}$. As the reverse inequality always holds, the conclusion follows. □

Before we provide simple sufficient conditions ensuring this geometrical condition, we will illustrate it using our previous example.

Example 3.2 *Consider the same example as in Example 3.1. We observe that, in this case* A, Q_1 *are zero matrices and* q_1, a *are zero vectors, and so, the set* Ω *becomes*

$$\Omega := \{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ (x_1 - s_1)^2 + (x_2 - s_2)^2 \end{bmatrix} : (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2 \} + \mathbb{R}^4_+ .$$

Then

$$\Omega = \{[z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4]^\top : [z_1, z_4]^\top \in \Omega_1, z_2 \geq -1, z_3 \geq -1\},$$

where

$$\Omega_1 = \{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2 \\ (x_1 - s_1)^2 + (x_2 - s_2)^2 \end{bmatrix} : (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ \times \mathbb{R}^2 \} + \mathbb{R}^2_+ .$$

Now we provide an analytic expression for Ω_1*. Note that, if* $x_1 = 0$*, then* $[\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2, (x_1 - s_1)^2 + (x_2 - s_2)^2]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$ *and* $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \subseteq \Omega_1$ *(take* $x_2 = s_2 \geq 0$ *and* $s_1 \geq 0 = x_1$ *to get an arbitrary point* $(x_2^2, s_1^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$*). Thus we only need to consider the case where* $x_1 \neq 0$*. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2 \\ (x_1 - s_1)^2 + (x_2 - s_2)^2 \end{bmatrix} : \mathsf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^2_+, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \mathsf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ \alpha t \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \} + \mathbb{R}^2_+ \\ &= \{ \begin{bmatrix} (\frac{1}{2} + 2\alpha + \alpha^2)t^2 \\ \min\{t, 0\}^2 + \min\{\alpha t, 0\}^2 \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} t \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \} + \mathbb{R}^2_+ , \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by noting that $\min_{s\geq 0}(x-s)^2 = \min\{x,0\}^2$. *Direct verification now shows that*

$$\Omega_1 = \{[a_1, a_2]^\top : a_2 \geq -a_1 \geq 0\} \cup \mathbb{R}^2_+ ,$$

which is closed and convex. Therefore, Ω *is also closed and convex.*

Next, we provide some verifiable sufficient conditions guaranteeing convexity as well as closedness of Ω. To do this, recall that an $n \times n$ matrix M is called a Z-matrix if its off-diagonal elements M_{ij} with $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $i \neq j$, are all non-positive. We also need the following joint-range convexity for Z-matrices.

Lemma 3.3 *Let* M_i, $i \in [1\!:\!q]$, *be symmetric* Z*-matrices of order* n. *Then*

$$\{(\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}_1 \mathsf{x}, \ldots, \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{M}_q \mathsf{x}) : \mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} + \mathbb{R}^q_+$$

is a convex cone.

Proof. The proof is similar to [18, Theorem 5.1]. □

Proposition 3.1 *Suppose that* $\mathsf{Q}_0, \mathsf{Q}_1$, $\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A}$ *are all* Z*-matrices,* $\mathsf{B} = -\mathsf{I}_n$ *and* $\mathsf{q}_0, \mathsf{q}_1, \mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}$ *are zero vectors. Then* Ω *is convex.*

Proof. Let $\bar{h}_0(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x}$, $\bar{h}_1(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_1 x$, $\bar{h}_2(\mathsf{y}) = \|\mathsf{Ax}\|^2$ and $\bar{h}_3(\mathsf{y}) = \|\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{s}\|^2$ with $\mathsf{y} = (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x})$. We first note that $\Omega = (0, -1, -1, 0) + \bar{\Omega}$, where

$$\bar{\Omega} = \{(\bar{h}_0(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_1(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_2(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_3(\mathsf{y})) : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n\} + \mathbb{R}^4_+.$$

To see the convexity of Ω, it suffices to show that $\bar{\Omega}$ is convex. To verify this, take $(u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3) \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \bar{\Omega}$, and let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then there exist $(\hat{\mathsf{s}}, \hat{\mathsf{x}}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(\tilde{\mathsf{s}}, \tilde{\mathsf{x}}) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\bar{h}_i(\hat{\mathsf{s}}, \hat{\mathsf{x}}) \leq u_i \text{ and } \bar{h}_i(\tilde{\mathsf{s}}, \tilde{\mathsf{x}}) \leq v_i, \ i = 1, 2, 3.$$

In particular, $u_3, v_3 \geq 0$. We now verify that

$$\lambda(u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3) + (1 - \lambda)(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Note that

$$\bar{h}_0(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{y}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{Q}_0 \end{bmatrix} \mathsf{y},\ \bar{h}_1(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{y}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{Q}_1 \end{bmatrix} \mathsf{y},\ \bar{h}_2(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{y}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} \end{bmatrix} \mathsf{y},$$

and

$$\bar{h}_3(\mathsf{y}) = \mathsf{y}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{I}_n & -\mathsf{I}_n \\ -\mathsf{I}_n & \mathsf{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \mathsf{y},$$

and the associated matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{Q}_0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{Q}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{O}^\top \\ \mathsf{O} & \mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{I}_n & -\mathsf{I}_n \\ -\mathsf{I}_n & \mathsf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

are all Z-matrices. We see that

$$\{(\bar{h}_0(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_1(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_2(\mathsf{y}), \bar{h}_3(\mathsf{y})) : \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n\} + \mathbb{R}^4_+$$

is convex. So, there exists $(\mathsf{r}, \mathsf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\bar{h}_i(\mathsf{r}, \mathsf{z}) \leq \lambda u_i + (1-\lambda)v_i, i = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Denote $\mathsf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$. Let $|\mathsf{z}| = (|z_1|, \ldots, |z_n|)$. Note from the Z-matrices assumptions that

$$\bar{h}_i(|\mathsf{z}|, |\mathsf{z}|) = |\mathsf{z}|^\top \mathsf{Q}_i |\mathsf{z}| \leq \mathsf{z}^\top \mathsf{Q}_i \mathsf{z} \leq \lambda u_i + (1-\lambda)v_i,\ i = 0, 1,$$

$$\bar{h}_2(|\mathsf{z}|, |\mathsf{z}|) = |\mathsf{z}|^\top (\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A}) |\mathsf{z}| \leq \mathsf{z}^\top (\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A}) \mathsf{z} \leq \lambda u_2 + (1-\lambda)v_2$$

and

$$\bar{h}_3(|\mathsf{z}|, |\mathsf{z}|) = 0 \leq \lambda u_3 + (1-\lambda)v_3.$$

Therefore, $\lambda(u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3) + (1-\lambda)(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \bar{\Omega}$, and so the conclusion follows. □

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose that there exist $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i \in [0\!:\!2]$, such that*

$$\tau_0 \mathsf{Q}_0 + \tau_1 \mathsf{Q}_1 + \tau_2 \mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} \succ 0.$$

Then Ω is closed.

Proof. Let $\mathsf{r}^{(k)} \in \Omega$ such that $\mathsf{r}^{(k)} \to \mathsf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Then there exists $\mathsf{y}_k = (\mathsf{s}_k, \mathsf{x}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}_k) \leq r_i^{(k)} \quad \text{for all } i \in [0\!:\!3] \text{ and all } k\,.$$

We first see that $\{\mathsf{x}_k\}$ is bounded. To see this, note that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2} \tau_i f_i(\mathsf{x}_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{2} \tau_i \bar{f}_i(\mathsf{x}_k) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{2} \tau_i r_i^{(k)} \to \sum_{i=0}^{2} \tau_i r_i \,.$$

Since $\nabla^2\big(\sum_{i=0}^{2} \tau_i f_i\big)(\mathsf{x}) \equiv \tau_0\mathsf{Q}_0 + \tau_1\mathsf{Q}_1 + \tau_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} \succ 0$, this implies that $\{\mathsf{x}_k\}$ must be bounded. Taking into account that

$$\bar{f}_3(\mathsf{s}_k, \mathsf{x}_k) = \|\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}_k + \mathsf{s}_k - \mathsf{b}\|^2 \leq r_3^{(k)} \to r_3 \,,$$

it follows that also $\{\mathsf{s}_k\}$ is a bounded sequence. By passing to subsequences, we may assume that $\mathsf{y}_k = (\mathsf{s}_k, \mathsf{x}_k) \to (\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{x}) =: \mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Passing to the limit, we see that $\bar{f}_i(\mathsf{y}) \leq r_i,\ i{\in}[0\,{:}\,3]$ and so $\mathsf{r} \in \Omega$. Thus Ω is closed. □

3.3 Approximation hierarchies for semi-Lagrangian relaxations

In general, checking copositivity of a matrix is an NP-hard problem, and hence solving a copositive optimization problem is also NP-hard. Therefore, to compute the semi-Lagrangian, we need to approximate them by so-called *hierarchies,* i.e., a sequence of conic optimization problems involving tractable cones $\mathcal{K}_d^\star$ such that $\mathcal{K}_d^\star \subset \mathcal{K}_{d+1}^\star \subset \mathcal{C}_\Upsilon^\star$ where d is the level of the hierarchy, and $\mathrm{cl}(\bigcup_{d=0}^\infty \mathcal{K}_d^\star) = \mathcal{C}_\Upsilon^\star$. On the dual side, $\mathcal{K}_d$ are also tractable, $\mathcal{K}_{d+1} \subset \mathcal{K}_d$, and $\bigcap_{d=0}^\infty \mathcal{K}_d = \mathcal{C}_\Upsilon$.

One possibility would be the reduction of Υ-copositivity via Schur complements as in Lemma 2.1 above, reducing this question to a combination of psd and classical copositivity conditions, which can be treated by the classical approximation hierarchies. By now, there are many options explored for these hierarchies, for a concise survey see [7]. Many of these involve linear [10, 11] or psd constraints of matrices of order n^{d+2}, e.g. the seminal ones proposed in [21, 26]. However, the difficulty with this approach is the nonlinear dependence of the Schur complement $\mathsf{R} - \mathsf{S}^\top\mathsf{H}^\dagger\mathsf{S}$ on (μ, u). An alternative would be a more direct approach which we will sketch in the sequel, extending the sum-of-squares idea in Parrilo's work [26].

Let $I = \{1, \ldots, p+1\}$ and, for a matrix $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+n+1)\times(p+n+1)}$, define a quartic polynomial

$$p_{\mathsf{M}}(\mathsf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j)\in I\times I} M_{ij} y_i^2 y_j^2 + \sum_{i\in I, j\notin I} M_{ij} y_i^2 y_j + \sum_{i\notin I, j\in I} M_{ij} y_i y_j^2 + \sum_{i\notin I, j\notin I} M_{ij} y_i y_j \,.$$

Note that M is Υ-copositive if and only if $p_{\mathsf{M}}(\mathsf{y}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathsf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n+1}$. A sufficient condition for this is that the product $p_{\mathsf{M}}(\mathsf{y})\|\mathsf{y}\|^{2d} = p_{\mathsf{M}}(\mathsf{y})(\sum_k y_k^2)^d$ is a *sum-of-squares (s.o.s.)* polynomial, which automatically guarantees non-negativity of p_{M} over $\mathbb{R}^{p+n+1}$. Now it is natural to define

$$\mathcal{K}_d^\star := \left\{ \mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+n+1)\times(p+n+1)} : p_{\mathsf{M}}(\mathsf{y})\|\mathsf{y}\|^{2d} \text{ is a s.o.s. polynomial} \right\}.$$

Then, following the logic of classical hierarchies, it is not difficult to see that above properties hold, and that $\mathcal{K}_d^\star$ (and $\mathcal{K}_d$ itself) are tractable cones expressible by LMI conditions on matrices of order n^{d+2}. Thus, copositivity characterization of the semi-Lagrangian relaxation can be computed by using SDP hierarchies and polynomial optimization techniques [26]. Of course, LMIs on matrices of larger order pose a serious memory problem for algorithmic implementations even for moderate d if n is large. On the other hand, as shown below, sometimes even the zero-level approximation in this hierarchy can provide a much better bound as compared to the Lagrangian relaxation.

Example 3.3 (Zero-level approximation of semi-Lagrangians) *With the data from Example 3.1, recalling that the optimal value of this example is $z^* = 0$, we have*

$$\widehat{\mathsf{M}}(u) = \begin{bmatrix} u & 0 & -u & 0 \\ 0 & u & 0 & -u \\ -u & 0 & \frac{1}{2}+u & 1 \\ 0 & -u & 1 & 1+u \end{bmatrix} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathsf{M}(u,\mu) = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu & \mathsf{o}^\top \\ \mathsf{o} & \widehat{\mathsf{M}}(u) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the zero-level approximation problem for the semi-Lagrangian reads

$$(\mathrm{RP}) \qquad \sup_{(\mu,u)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \mu : p_{\mathsf{M}(u,\mu)} \textit{ is a s.o.s. polynomial} \right\}.$$

From the definition of $\mathsf{M}(u,\mu)$, we see that $p_{M(u,\mu)}$ is a s.o.s. polynomial if and only if $\mu \leq 0$ and

$$\widehat{p}_u(\mathsf{x}) = \left[x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3, x_4\right] \widehat{\mathsf{M}}(u) \begin{bmatrix} x_1^2 \\ x_2^2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix}$$

is a s.o.s. polynomial. This shows that

$$\mathrm{val}(\mathrm{RP}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \textit{if} \quad C \neq \emptyset, \\ -\infty, & \textit{else.} \end{cases}$$

where

$$C := \{u \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{p}_u \text{ is a s.o.s. polynomial}\}.$$

Using the "solvesos" command in the Matlab toolbox YALMIP [22], one can verify that $\hat{p}_u$ *is a s.o.s. polynomial if* $u = 1$. *Thus,* $\mathrm{val}(\mathrm{RP}) = 0$ *which agrees with the true optimal value* $z^* = 0$. *On the other hand, as computed in Example 3.1, the Lagrangian relaxation yields a trivial lower bound* $-\infty$.

4 Extended CDT Problems: exactness of semi-Lagrangian and Lagrangian relaxations

In this section, we examine the so-called extended CDT problem:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\mathrm{P_{CDT}}) & \min & \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} & \|\mathsf{x}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{a}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \le \mathsf{b}. \end{array}$$

This problem is a special case of our general model problem with $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \mathsf{I}_n$ and $\mathsf{q}_1 = \mathsf{o}$. In the cases where no linear inequalities are present, the problem (P_{CDT}) reduces to the so-called CDT problem (also referred as two-ball trust region problems, TTR). The CDT problem, in general, is much more challenging than the well-studied trust region problems and has received much attention lately, see for example [1, 5, 8, 13]. We will establish simple conditions ensuring exactness of the semi-Lagrangian relaxations and the usual Lagrangian relaxations of the extended CDT problem.

First of all, we note that the sufficient second-order global optimality condition in Theorem 3.1, specialized to the setting (P_{CDT}), yields the exact semi-Lagrangian result of extended CDT problems.

Corollary 4.1 *Let* $(\bar{\mathsf{x}}; \bar{\mathsf{u}}, \bar{\mathsf{v}}) \in F_{\mathrm{CDT}} \times \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times \mathbb{R}^p$ *be a generalized KKT pair of problem* (P_{CDT}) *where* F_{CDT} *is the feasible set of* (P_{CDT}). *Denote by* $\bar{\mu} := \bar{\mathsf{x}}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0 \bar{\mathsf{x}} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \bar{\mathsf{x}}$. *Suppose that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2 + \bar{u}_3\|\mathsf{b}\|^2 - \bar{\mu} & -\bar{u}_3\mathsf{b}^\top & \mathsf{q}_0^\top - \bar{u}_2\mathsf{a}^\top\mathsf{A} - \bar{u}_3\mathsf{b}^\top\mathsf{B} \\ -\bar{u}_3\mathsf{b} & \bar{u}_3\mathsf{I}_p & \bar{u}_3\mathsf{B} \\ \mathsf{q}_0 - \bar{u}_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{a} - \bar{u}_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{b} & \bar{u}_3\mathsf{B}^\top & \mathsf{Q}_0 + \bar{u}_1\mathsf{I}_n + \bar{u}_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} + \bar{u}_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{B} \end{bmatrix}$$

is $(\mathbb{R}^{p+1}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n)$*-copositive. Then* $\bar{\mathsf{x}}$ *is a globally optimal solution to problem* $(\mathrm{P_{CDT}})$ *and* $z^* = z^*_{\mathrm{semi}}$.

Proof. The conclusion is an immediate corollary of Theorem 3.1 with $\mathsf{Q}_1 = \mathsf{I}_n$ and $\mathsf{q}_1 = \mathsf{o}$. □

Next we examine when the usual Lagrangian relaxation is exact for the extended CDT problems.

In order to examine exact Lagrangian relaxation for the extended CDT problem, we define an auxiliary convex optimization problem

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{(AP)} & \min & \mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} & \|\mathsf{x}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x} - \mathsf{a}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x} \le \mathsf{b}\,, \end{array}$$

where

$$\mathsf{Q}_0^+ := \mathsf{Q}_0 - \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0)\mathsf{I}_n \succeq \mathsf{O}\,. \tag{13}$$

We first see that if the auxiliary convex problem (AP) has a minimizer on the sphere $\{\mathsf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathsf{x}\| = 1\}$, then an extended CDT problem has a tight semi-Lagrangian relaxation. We will provide a sufficient condition in terms of the original data guaranteeing this condition later (in Theorem 5.1).

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose that the auxiliary convex problem (AP) has a minimizer on the sphere* $\{\mathsf{x} : \|\mathsf{x}\| = 1\}$. *Then* $z^*_{\rm LD} = z^*_{\rm semi} = z^*$.

Proof. Recall that $z^*_{\rm LD} \le z^*_{\rm semi} \le z^*$. So it suffices to show that $z^*_{\rm LD} = z^*$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0) < 0$ (otherwise (P_{CDT}) is a convex quadratic problem and so $z^*_{\rm LD} = z^*$). Let x^* be a solution of (AP) with $\|\mathsf{x}^*\| = 1$. As $\lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0) < 0$, it follows from $\|\mathsf{x}\| \le 1$ for all $\mathsf{x} \in F_{\rm CDT}$ that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} z^* & = & \min\limits_{\mathsf{x}\in F_{\rm CDT}} f_0(\mathsf{x}) \ge \min\limits_{\mathsf{x}\in F_{\rm CDT}} [f_0(\mathsf{x}) + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0)(1 - \|\mathsf{x}\|^2)] \\ & = & \min\limits_{\mathsf{x}\in F_{\rm CDT}} \{\mathsf{x}^\top \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}\} + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0) \\ & = & \mathsf{x}^{*\top} \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x}^* + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}^* + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0) \\ & = & \mathsf{x}^{*\top} \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x}^* + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}^* + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0)\|\mathsf{x}^*\|^2 \\ & = & \mathsf{x}^{*\top} \mathsf{Q}_0 \mathsf{x}^* + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}^* \;=\; f_0(\mathsf{x}^*) \;\ge\; z^*\,, \end{array}$$

where the last inequality follows from feasibility of x^* for the extended CDT problem. This shows that $z^* = \mathrm{val}(\mathrm{AP}) + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0)$. Rewriting (AP) as

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\mathrm{AP1}) & \min\limits_{(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{s})\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^p_+} & \mathsf{x}^\top\mathsf{Q}_0^+\mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top\mathsf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} & \|\mathsf{x}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x}-\mathsf{a}\|^2 \le 1 \\ & & \|\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}+\mathsf{s}-\mathsf{b}\|^2 = 0\,, \end{array}$$

we obtain the Lagrangian dual of this problem which can be stated as

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\mathrm{LD1}) & \sup\limits_{(u_3,u_1,u_2,\mathsf{v})\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{p+2}_+} & \inf\limits_{(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{s})\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^p} \{\mathsf{x}^\top\mathsf{Q}_0^+\mathsf{x} + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top\mathsf{x} + u_1 f_1(\mathsf{x}) \\ & & \qquad +u_2 f_2(\mathsf{x}) + u_3(\|\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}+\mathsf{s}-\mathsf{b}\|^2) - 2\mathsf{v}^\top\mathsf{s}\} \\ = & \sup\limits_{(\mu,u_3,u_1,u_2,\mathsf{v})\in\mathbb{R}^{\nu}\times\mathbb{R}^{p+2}_+} & \{\mu : \tilde{\mathsf{M}}(\mu,\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v}) \succeq 0\}\,, \end{array}$$

where $\tilde{\mathsf{M}}(\mu,\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v})$ denotes the matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} -u_1-u_2+u_3\|\mathsf{b}\|^2-\mu & -u_3\mathsf{b}^\top-\mathsf{v}^\top & -\mathsf{q}_0^\top-u_2\mathsf{a}^\top\mathsf{A}-u_3\mathsf{b}^\top\mathsf{B} \\ -u_3\mathsf{b}-\mathsf{v} & u_3\mathsf{I}_p & u_3\mathsf{B} \\ -\mathsf{q}_0-u_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{a}-u_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{b} & u_3\mathsf{B}^\top & \mathsf{Q}_0^+ + u_1\mathsf{I}_n + u_2\mathsf{A}^\top\mathsf{A} + u_3\mathsf{B}^\top\mathsf{B} \end{array}\right].$$

Note that the feasible set of (AP1) is bounded by $\|\mathsf{x}\| \le 1$ and $\mathsf{s} = \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}-\mathsf{b}$ for all feasible (x,s). Since any convex optimization problem with compact feasible set enjoys a zero duality gap (for example see [20]), it follows that

$$\mathrm{val}(\mathrm{AP}) = \mathrm{val}(\mathrm{LD1})\,.$$

Finally, the conclusion results by noting that $\mathrm{val}(\mathrm{LD1}) = z^*_{\mathrm{LD}} + \lambda_{\min}(\mathsf{Q}_0)$. So we have $z^* = z^*_{\mathrm{LD}}$ and furthermore $z^*_{\mathrm{LD}} = z^*_{\mathrm{semi}} = z^*$. □

Next, we provide a simple sufficient condition formulated in terms of the original data guaranteeing the exact relaxations. Moreover, we note that this sufficient condition can be efficiently verified by solving a feasibility problem of a linear optimization problem.

Theorem 4.1 *Let* $\mathsf{M} = [\mathsf{Q}_0^+, \mathsf{A}]^\top$. *Suppose that*

$$\ker(\mathsf{M}) \cap \{\mathsf{v}\in\mathbb{R}^n : \mathsf{B}\mathsf{v} \le \mathsf{o}\} \cap \{\mathsf{v} : \mathsf{q}_0^\top\mathsf{v} \ge 0\} \neq \{\mathsf{o}\}\,.$$

Then $z^*_{\mathrm{LD}} = z^*_{\mathrm{semi}} = z^*$.

Proof. By the preceding lemma, the conclusion follows if we show that the auxiliary convex problem (AP) has a minimizer on the sphere $\{\mathsf{x} : \|\mathsf{x}\| = 1\}$. Suppose that a minimizer x^* of (AP) satisfies $\|\mathsf{x}^*\| < 1$. Let $\mathsf{v} \in \ker(\mathsf{M}) \cap \{\mathsf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathsf{B}\mathsf{v} \leq \mathsf{o}\} \cap \{\mathsf{v} : \mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{v} \geq 0\}$ with $\mathsf{v} \neq \mathsf{o}$. Consider $\mathsf{x}(t) = \mathsf{x}^* + t\mathsf{v}$, $t \geq 0$. Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\|\mathsf{x}(t_0)\| = 1$. Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathsf{x}(t_0)^\top \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x}(t_0) + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}(t_0) \\ = \; & \mathsf{x}^{*\top} \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x}^* + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}^* - 2t_0 \mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{v} \\ \leq \; & \mathsf{x}^{*\top} \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \mathsf{x}^* + 2\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{x}^* , \\ & \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x}(t_0) - \mathsf{a}\|^2 = \|\mathsf{A}\mathsf{x}^* - \mathsf{a}\|^2 \leq 1 , \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}(t_0) - \mathsf{b} = \mathsf{B}\mathsf{x}^* - \mathsf{b} + t_{\mathsf{B}}\mathsf{v} \leq \mathsf{o} .$$

This shows that $\mathsf{x}(t_0)$ is a minimizer for (AP) and $\|\mathsf{x}(t_0)\| = 1$. The conclusion follows. □

Remark 4.1 (Links to the known dimension condition for exact relaxation) *In the special case where* $\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{O}$ *and* $\mathsf{a} = \mathsf{o} \in \mathbb{R}^n$*, the authors showed in [19], that under the dimension condition*

$$\dim \ker \mathsf{Q}_0^+ \geq \dim \operatorname{span}[\mathsf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{b}_p] + 1 ,$$

where $\mathsf{b}_i^\top$ *is the* i*th row of* B*, the SDP (or Lagrangian) relaxation is exact. We observe that this dimension condition is strictly stronger than our sufficient condition in the preceding theorem.*

Firstly, we see that the dimension condition implies our sufficient condition in the preceding theorem. To see this, suppose the above dimension condition holds. Then there exists $\mathsf{v} \neq \mathsf{o}$ *such that* $\mathsf{v} \in \ker \mathsf{Q}_0^+$ *and* $\mathsf{b}_i^\top \mathsf{v} = 0$ *for all* $i \in [1\!:\!p]$ *(and hence* $\mathsf{B}\mathsf{v} = \mathsf{o}$*). By replacing* v *by* $-\mathsf{v}$ *if necessary, we can assume that* $\mathsf{q}_0^\top \mathsf{v} \geq 0$*. Thus, our sufficient condition in the preceding theorem holds.*

To see the dimension condition is strictly stronger, let us consider $\mathsf{Q}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathsf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathsf{q}_0 = \mathsf{a} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{b}_1^\top = [-1, 0]$*. Clearly,* $\dim \ker \mathsf{Q}_0^+ = \dim \ker \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = 1$ *and* $\dim \operatorname{span}[\mathsf{b}_1] = 1$*, and so the dimension condition fails. On the other hand, our sufficient condition reads*

$$\{\mathsf{o}\} \neq \ker \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\top \cap \{\mathsf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -v_1 \leq 0\} = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} ,$$

which is obviously satisfied.

References

[1] Wenbo Ai and Shuzhong Zhang. Strong duality for the CDT subproblem: a necessary and sufficient condition. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 19(4):1735–1756, 2009.

[2] Paula A. Amaral and Immanuel M. Bomze. Copositivity-based approximations for mixed-integer fractional quadratic optimization. *Pacific J. Optimiz.*, 11(2):225–238, 2015.

[3] Paula A. Amaral, Immanuel M. Bomze, and Joaquim J. Júdice. Copositivity and constrained fractional quadratic problems. *Math. Program.*, 146(1–2):325–350, 2014.

[4] Amir Ardestani-Jaafari and Erick Delage. Linearized robust counterparts of two-stage robust optimization problems with applications in operations management. Preprint, HEC Montréal, `http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2016/01/5388.html`, 2016.

[5] Amir Beck and Yonina Eldar. Strong duality in nonconvex quadratic optimization with two quadratic constraints. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 17(3):844–860, 2006.

[6] Immanuel M. Bomze. Copositive relaxation beats Lagrangian dual bounds in quadratically and linearly constrained QPs. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(3):1249–1275, 2015.

[7] Immanuel M. Bomze, Mirjam Dür, and Chung-Piaw Teo. Copositive optimization. *Optima – MOS Newsletter*, 89:2–10, 2012.

[8] Immanuel M. Bomze and Michael L. Overton. Narrowing the difficulty gap for the Celis-Dennis-Tapia problem. *Math. Program. Series B*, 151(2):459–476, 2015.

[9] Immanuel M. Bomze, Werner Schachinger, and Reinhard Ullrich. New lower bounds and asymptotics for the cp-rank. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 36(1):20–37, 2015.

[10] Stefan Bundfuss and Mirjam Dür. Algorithmic copositivity detection by simplicial partition. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 428(7):1511–1523, 2008.

[11] Stefan Bundfuss and Mirjam Dür. An adaptive linear approximation algorithm for copositive programs. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 20(1):30–53, 2009.

[12] Samuel Burer. On the copositive representation of binary and continuous nonconvex quadratic programs. *Math. Program.*, 120(2, Ser. A):479–495, 2009.

[13] Samuel Burer and Kurt Anstreicher. Second-order-cone constraints for extended trust-region subproblems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(1):432–451, 2013.

[14] Andrew R. Conn, Nicholas I. M. Gould, and Philippe L. Toint. *Trust-region methods*. MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2000.

[15] Peter J. C. Dickinson and Luuk Gijben. On the computational complexity of membership problems for the completely positive cone and its dual. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 57(2):403–415, 2014.

[16] Alain Faye and Frédéric Roupin. Partial Lagrangian relaxation for general quadratic programming. *4OR*, 5:75–88, 2007.

[17] Grani A. Hanasusanto and Daniel Kuhn. Conic programming reformulations of two-stage distributionally robust linear programs over Wasserstein balls. Preprint, EPFL, `http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2016/01/5647.html`, 2016.

[18] Vaithilingam Jeyakumar, Gue Myung Lee, and Guoyin Li. Alternative theorems for quadratic inequality systems and global quadratic optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 20(2):983–1001, 2009.

[19] Vaithilingam Jeyakumar and Guoyin Li. Trust-region problems with linear inequality constraints: exact SDP relaxation, global optimality and robust optimization. *Math. Program.*, 147(Ser. A):171–206, 2014.

[20] Vaithilingam Jeyakumar and Henry Wolkowicz. Zero duality gaps in infinite-dimensional programming. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 67(1):87–108, 1990.

[21] Jean Bernard Lasserre. Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 11(3):796–817, 2000/01.

[22] Johan Löfberg. Pre- and post-processing sum-of-squares programs in practice. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 54:1007–1011, 2009.

[23] Theodore S. Motzkin. Copositive quadratic forms. Projects and Publications of the National Applied Mathematics Laboratories, Quarterly Report, April through June 1952, pp. 11–12, No. 1818, National Bureau of Standards, 1952.

[24] Katta G. Murty and Santosh N. Kabadi. Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Math. Program.*, 39(2):117–129, 1987.

[25] Kathik Natarajan, Chung Piaw Teo, and Zhichao Zheng. Mixed zero-one linear programs under objective uncertainty: a completely positive representation. *Operations Research*, 59(3):713–728, 2011.

[26] Pablo A. Parrilo. *Structured Semidefinite Programs and Semi-algebraic Geometry Methods in Robustness and Optimization*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, May 2000.

[27] Naomi Shaked-Monderer, Abraham Berman, Immanuel M. Bomze, Florian Jarre, and Werner Schachinger. New results on the cp rank and related properties of co(mpletely)positive matrices. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 63(2):384–396, 2015.

[28] Naum Z. Shor. Quadratic optimization problems. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Tekhn. Kibernet.*, 222(1):128–139, 1987.

[29] Guanglin Xu and Samuel Burer. A copositive approach for two-stage adjustable robust optimization with uncertain right-hand sides. Preprint, Univ. of Iowa, `http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2016/01/5646.html`, 2016.

[30] Boshi Yang and Samuel Burer. A two-variable analysis of the two-trust-region subproblem. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 26(1):661–680, 2016.

[31] Ya-Xiang Yuan. On a subproblem of trust region algorithms for constrained optimization. *Math. Program.*, 47(1, (Ser. A)):53–63, 1990.